

Remarks

Claims 23-31 were pending. Claims 23 and 30 have been amended. No claims have been added or cancelled. Thus claims 23-31 are subject to continued examination.

Anticipation Rejections

Claims 23-24, 26, 29 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Leonard Farias' research report entitled *Comparison Study of Polymer Research Finish to a Conventional Resin System: A Laundering Study*.

Claims 23-24, 26 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cain (US 3,634,126). Continued rejection on these grounds is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim (MPEP § 2131).

Claims 23 and 30 have been amended to reflect the limitations that the softener is a dried softener foam and the durable-press resin is a dried durable-press resin foam. The Farias report describes the dipping of garments in resin formulations (see pg. 3-4) followed by tumble drying. This report does not describe

the use of dried resin foams and thus cannot constitute anticipation. Similarly, the invention described in Coan contemplates thoroughly impregnating the fabric substrate with the composition in a liquid carrier as an initial step. Thus, the composition and the liquid carrier can be applied to the fabric by any known method such as dipping, brushing, spraying, immersing, padding, coating, etc.,....(Col. 3, lines 9-14). Since Farias and Coan both fail to disclose a durable-press resin isolated on one face of a fabric wherein said durable-press resin is a dried durable-press resin foam and a softener isolated on the other face of the fabric wherein said softener is a dried softener foam, Applicants respectfully submit that the conditions of anticipation have not been met and request that the rejections not be maintained.

Obviousness Rejections

Claims 25, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Leonard Farias' research report entitled *Comparison Study of Polymer Research Finish to a Conventional Resin System: A Laundering Study*. Claims 30-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Schwemmer et al. (US 3,811,834). Continued rejection on these grounds is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness there must be some suggestion or motivation that would lead to the claimed invention. The suggestion or motivation may derive from the references themselves or from the knowledge generally available to those of skill in the art. In addition, all the claim limitations

must be taught or suggested by the prior art (MPEP § 2142). Applicants respectfully submit that these standards are not met with regard to the claims as now presented.

As discussed above, the Farias report describes dipping of fabrics into resin formulations followed by drying. There is no suggestion or teaching of the utilization of resin or softener foams as a means of isolating the resin to one face and the softener to the other face. Moreover, the invention described in Farias relies on thoroughly wetting the fabric with the resin formulation and relying on migration of the resin to the exposed surface of the fabric during drying.

Similarly, Schwemmer describes application of a bath containing the reactive finishing agent or agents, possibly also auxiliary agents such as catalysts, softeners, and so forth, to the textile material in such manner that the textile material is imbued as uniformly as possible and at all locations thereof with the finishing bath (Col. 1, lines 23-28). Schwemmer provides no suggestion or teaching which utilizes dried softener foams or dried durable-press resin foams. Consequently, applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejections should not be maintained.

Conclusion:

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all claims now stand in condition for allowance. Should any issues remain after consideration of this Amendment and accompanying Remarks, the Examiner is

invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned in the hope that any such issue may be promptly and satisfactorily resolved.

In the event that there are additional fees associated with the submission of these papers (including extension of time fees), authorization is hereby provided to withdraw such fees from Deposit Account No. 50-1424.

Respectfully submitted,



James M. Robertson
Registration No. 36,905
(864) 583-0030 (phone)
(864) 583-0002 (FAX)